DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 284 829 SP 028 876

AUTHOR Jones, Noel K.; Cooper, Mary Gendernalik
TITLE Teacher Effectiveness and Education: A Case of Incompatibility? North Carolina's Effective Teaching Training Program: Implications for Social Studies. Implications for Language Curricula.
PUB DATE Apr 87
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Washington, DC, April 20-24, 1987).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Critical Thinking; Educational Research; *Language Arts; Professional Autonomy; *Social Studies; *Teacher Effectiveness; *Teaching Methods; Theory Practice Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Direct Instruction; *Effective Teacher Training Program NC

ABSTRACT

The Effective Teacher Training Program in North Carolina is based upon correlational studies primarily limited to the areas of reading, math and language knowledge and to learning outcomes that consist of basic skills, factual knowledge, and concept name identification. Despite warnings against overgeneralization within the studies themselves, the direct instruction model, which receives support from this research, is being applied to instruction in all areas of the curriculum and to all levels of learning. This instructional model conflicts with the way learning is understood in social studies and with evidence indicating that direct instruction inhibits the development of critical thinking and inquiry--aims highly valued by social studies educators. This paper challenges the assumption that effective teaching practices are neutral concerning curriculum choices and argues that a behaviorist logical-positivist model of curriculum is being imposed on all teachers even though there is strong evidence that this model is inconsistent with conditions that foster the development of language competence and literacy. It is concluded that, both in social studies and in language arts, teachers must be allowed to make professional informed decisions about learning activities so that they can select appropriate conditions for types and levels of learning. (Author/MT)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED284829

# TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS AND EDUCATION: A CASE OF INCOMPATIBILITY?

## North Carolina's Effective Teaching Training Program: Implications for Social Studies Implications for Language Curricula

Noel K. Jones
University of North Carolina, Wilmington

Mary Gendernalik Cooper
San Diego State University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

N. Jones

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Paper presented at annual meeting of
American Educational Research Association
Washington, D.C.

April 1987

SP028876

# TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS AND EDUCATION: A CASE OF INCOMPATIBILITY?

The North Carolina Effective Teaching Program
Implications for Social Studies
Implications for Language Curricula

Noel K. Jones
Mary Gendernalik-Cooper

## ABSTRACT

The Effective Teacher Training Program in North Carolina is based upon correlational studies primarily limited to the areas of reading, math and language knowledge and to learning outcomes that consist of basic skills, factual knowledge and concept name identification. Despite warnings against over-generalization within the studies themselves, the direct instruction model, which receives support from this research, is being applied to instruction in all areas of the curriculum and to all levels of learning. This instructional model conflicts with the way learnings are conceived in social studies and with evidence indicating that the elements of direct instruction inhibit the development of critical thinking and inquiry--aims highly valued by social studies educators. Additionally, this paper challenges the assumption that effective teaching practices are neutral concerning curriculum choices. The argument is made that a behaviorist logical-positivist model of curriculum is being imposed on all teachers even though there is strong evidence that this model is inconsistent with conditions that foster the development of language competence and of literacy. It is concluded that, both in social studies and in language arts, teachers must be allowed to make professional, informed decisions about learning activities so that they can select appropriate conditions to match types and levels of learning. The Effective Teacher Training Program is an obstacle to this goal.

# TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS AND EDUCATION: A CASE OF INCOMPATIBILITY?

## North Carolina's Effective Teaching Training Program:
## Part I. Implications for Social Studies
## Part II. Implications for Language Curricula

### Introduction

The Effective Teacher Training Program now being mandated across North Carolina represents an extremely problematic approach to improving instruction and learning. It is problematic primarily because it conveys the impression that its elements are integrative and generic, applicable to all learners, learnings, content areas and settings. Neither the research studies which generated the "effective teaching" label, nor analyses and reviews of these studies support such claims. Even the review contracted by the state of North Carolina (and from which references in the training manual are excerpted) does not support such an impression. The authors are quite clear:

> The conclusions derived from the integrative review are constrained by the number of research studies that have been done on the teaching practice in question. Related to this is the further limitation of the conditional nature of the conclusions. Two aspects of this limitation stand out. First, there is no teaching practice that has been researched for every subject taught in school. By

far, most of the studies available were done at the elementary school level and in the basic skills subjects of reading and mathematics. Noticeably lacking are studies at the high school level and studies in the teaching of science, social studies, literature, foreign languages, and non-academic subjects such as music, art, and physical education. ...

With respect to attempting to derive a total picture of teaching, it is important to recognize that the available research is not in itself integrative. Thus, there is no empirical evidence that addresses if and/or how various teaching practices and teaching functions combine into a total model of teaching. Therefore, at this time, each of the teaching functions described in the review must be interpreted as a discrete entity. (White et.al., 1983)

The selection criteria employed by these researchers for including or excluding studies further substantiates caution in perceiving the research results as in integrative model. Specifically the criteria excluded studies that dealt with clusters of teaching practices that were highly integrated or sequenced and thus could not be delineated. Teaching practices that could not be directly observed in the daily routine of the classroom were also eliminated from the review. Only empirical studies of the positivist process-product type were included; the consequence of engaging in the teaching practice had to be related either to student achievement or to increased time-on-task by the students who were exposed to the teaching practice

(White et.al., 1983).

These cautions appear not to be heeded in either the ETTP training manual or the actual training of teachers. The "effective teaching" research studies themselves are clear and precise about the learners, learnings, content areas and settings for which their recommended practices are effective. The first part of this paper provides a summary review of these studies. In the second part of the paper, the implications of these studies for Social Studies are examined; and in the final section, the implications for language curricula are discussed.

## Summary Review of Effective Teaching Research

Effective Teaching Research includes naturalistic as well as experimental studies. It reflects the positivist process-product approach to ascertaining the influence of teaching practice/behaviors on learning outcomes. Representative "effective teaching" studies of this type include the work of Brophy (1976), Anderson, Evertson, and Brophy (1979), Stallings and Kaskowitz (1974), and Good and Grouws (1979). In these studies as well as others, effective teaching practices were identified by correlating observable teacher behaviors, the process component, with gains on achievement tests for classes of students (not individual students), the product component. The teaching practices identified by these students as effective are compositely represented by the direct instruction model. According to Rosenshine (1979, 1986), the elements of this model include an academic focus, a teacher-centered focus,

little student choice of activities and materials, use of large groups rather than small groups for instruction, limited exploration of ideas, drill and high percentages of correct answers. Common sense makes this model appealing. It is difficult not to assume the universal appropriateness of the specific teacher behaviors or sequences of behaviors encompassed by this model. Before succumbing, however, the learnings and learners for whom these practices were found to be effective, and conversely, those for which they are not effective must be reviewed.

The learning outcomes for which these practices are effective are explicit, well-structured information and skills that can be broken down into psychologically real, discrete parts: the basic skills--grammatical rules, vocabulary, decoding and mathematical computation procedures. In short, the types of learnings found on elementary level standardized achievement tests. Of the few studies done in subjects other than math and reading, positive correlations were found only in those where the learning outcomes were of a factual or concept naming nature. (Fortune 1967, Armento 1977) The direct instruction model and specific practices encompassed by it are not just less effective, but even ineffective when learnings are more complex or integrative rather than additive in nature--such things as abstract thinking (inferential, critical, evaluative), concept formulation, problem posing or finding, generative problem solving and reading comprehension beyond the literal level--or affective in nature (Brophy 1979,

Peterson 1979, Good 1979, Kozma 1982, Lockheed 1981, Pearson and Gallagher 1983). The May 1985 issue of Educational Leadership provides a comprehensive and revealing discussion of direct instruction as it relates to thinking skills as learning outcomes. Essentially, the articles in this issue describe the more and less appropriate applications of direct instruction. These articles reflect a recurrent theme in the effective teaching research itself (but one left unacknowledged in ETTP); namely, methods are to be selected and utilized by reflective informed teachers on the basis of what learnings are being addressed and what the learners are like.

The effective teaching research is similarly cautious in asserting that the practices work well in the elementary grades (Anderson, Evertson, Brophy 1979, Good and Grouws 1979, Stallings et.al., 1975 and 1978, Medley 1977). But even at that level there is variability in the findings. Low ability youngsters and those whose demonstrate external locus of control are most positively served by the "effective practices" (Peterson 1979, Medley 1978). In her review, McFall (1983) notes that student learning style and level of conceptual complexity may well mediate the effectiveness of these teaching practices. Ebmeier and Good (Good 1979) seem to concur that student SES also mediates the "effectiveness" of teaching practices. His review indicates that practices deemed effective with low SES students were the reverse of practices deemed effective with higher SES students. Brophy and Evertson (1976, 1978) also note the need to vary specific teacher behaviors,

given different SES levels of classes.

The number of effective teaching replication studies done at the middle grades and high school levels are too few to warrant generalizing the practices identified in the original elementary school studies. (See FIGURE 1)

Fisher (1978), Evertson, Anderson, and Brophy (1978), Redfield and Rousseau (1981), and Gall (1984) for example, question the direct transferability of elementary classroom effective teaching practices to upper grade settings. Older students are more likely to "tune out" to the direct instruction practices of patterned questioning and teacher-centeredness. They are also less likely to be kept interested and on-task with low level questions and corrective response--drill and practice activities. They demonstrate higher investment in instruction that encourages and incorporates their own ideas and impressions. Good and Grouws (1979), Fortune (1967) and others contend however, that the practices do transfer, provided that the intended learning outcomes are of a similar nature to the basic skills and information types emphasized in primary grades.

Other more general concerns and questions about the findings of this research further reveal the limits of their application. Good (1979, pp. 61-62) notes, for example, that even in the elementary grades the recommended practices and structure of direct instruction may not be useful in social studies, art, or problem identifying/defining. He is also concerned that misuses based on lack of understanding will result in

promoting rote, meaningless drill practices, and that teachers may not be helpful to students in "learning how to learn" or in developing life skill applications of learnings. Good acknowledges Doyle's (1978) review of the process-product effective teaching research and the issue of whether use of the practices recommended in this research will foster excessive learner dependence on the teacher as "heart pacer," and produce students unable to process information independently. Good's suggestion is to gradually ease out or wean students from direct instruction, but only after basic skills as measured on achievement tests, are improved. Good concludes his own review of effective teaching research by noting:

> The appropriate question (as suggested here and by Peterson, 1978) is, 'What are the circumstances under which an educational model best works?' Not, 'What is the best educational model?' Extant data suggest that direct instruction is a reasonable model for enhancing general achievement gains at least in the early elementary school years. Within the context that it has been studied (math, reading, short-term achievement goals), direct instruction appears to be a consistently effective teaching method. These results may be useful for educators if they do not overreact to them.
>
> If direct instruction is seen as a set of specific behaviors or as a generic form of teaching that transcends all settings, then it is another polemic...another educational shibboleth. However, if it is used as an orienting

concept that has to be adjusted sensibly and sensitively to different educational settings, then the concept has some value for the practitioner." (Good, 1979, p. 63)

ETTP is being variably implemented across the state. In some places it reflects viewing direct instruction as a set of specific behaviors to be found in the practices of all teachers at all times; in other settings it is being communicated to teachers as a generic form of teaching, with similar implementation implications. Both tacks distort the research. And as will be discussed in the next two parts of this paper, both impede good Social Studies instruction and learning and good language curricula and learning.

## Implications for Social Studies

ETTP is problematic to Social Studies educators for three reasons. The most compelling reasons are: first, the incongruence between the social studies educator's conceptualization of learners and learnings, and that which is reflected in the effective teaching research. The second reason relates to the instructional implications of these conceptualizations.

Social studies educators have long since abandoned as inaccurate and unproductive the positivist/behaviorist paradigm so evident in the effective teaching research. Within that paradigm the learner, as active participant, mediator of input, generator of output, independent variable, is all but ignored. For the most part social studies educators are suspicious of an explanatory schema that posits observable teacher behaviors as

the sole stimuli for gains or losses in achievement test scores. Such thinking is reductionism at its worst. Social studies educator's conceptual framework is more rooted in the cognitive constructionist's orientation represented by Wittrock, Tobias, Fenstermacher, Taba and Bruner. Within this orientation, the internal constructive processes of the learner are emphasized. The learner and the mental lives of the teacher and students are perceived as being the real keys to better understanding of classroom phenomena. Armento summarizes this orientation as well as its major research foci most succinctly:

> ...Researchers are beginning to recognize that human behavior cannot be properly studied in isolation; thoughts, intentions and affect that prompt action must be taken into account....
>
> Incoming stimuli are reorganized, these researchers believe, on the basis of the learners prior knowledge, value orientations, and the constructive processes employed by the student in particular learning situations. It would follow from this that students and teachers are active constructors of meaning. If this is true, then studies that have "compared the external characteristics of instructional methods (overt behaviors) have obscured the most important variable accounting for learning and instruction: macroprocesses, or the frequency and intensity with which students cognitively process instructional input" (Tobias 1982, pp. 4-5)....

The behaviorist paradigm is simply inadequate to address these

questions.

Recent research efforts based on the constructive orientation are exploring student macroprocessing: how instructional methods/strategies influence it; how social knowledge and perspective is constructed within the classroom; and the potential that a variety of instructional techniques have for "helping students generate meaning, develop images of new ideas and relate these ideas to those previously learned." (Armento 1986, pp. 946-948) Initial experimental studies comparing constructivist based instructional strategies (generative teaching models) with more traditional strategies (teacher-centered) are yielding impressive results. In one such study, (McKenzie and White 1982) the experimental students' retention rate was 90%, twelve weeks after the instruction. The other two groups retained considerably less: 58% for the traditional field trip group, and 51% for the classroom group. In general, the research efforts substantiate the viability of the constructivist orientation and its potential explanatory power regarding instruction and learning. Social studies educators find the constructivist orientation more compatible than that of the behaviorist with how they view social studies learnings and therefore of greater practical relevance.

And practical relevance is the second source of social studies educator's difficulties with ETTP. All the major learnings in social studies are by their nature complex, dynamic and fluid. None of them can be meaningfully learned unless the learner is engaging in the process to which each is

intrinsically linked. Concepts are only meaningfully learned, for example, by active learner engagement in conceptualizing--messing around with or playing with a concept's dimensions: it's attributes, possible examples and non-examples, formulating its rule/definition, relating it to other concepts, prior learnings, etc. (Taba 1966, 1971, Martorella 1972, 1985). Having students observe a teacher playing with a conceptual idea, as Good recommends, is no substitute. Nor is didactic concept teaching. The impression of efficiency conveyed by this "scripted" instruction is misleading. The learner is only likely to recall what the teacher has said and presented, not to have made the concept meaningful and useful to himself.

Similarly, generalization learning and utilization require an instructional setting/approach wherein the learner practices generalizing: formulating, defining, testing and applying. Values are learned by valuing and critical assessment of values in action. Social inquiry and problem-solving learning likewise require an instructional setting that encourages and engages the learner as discoverer/generator (Fair and Shafter 1967, Martorella 1972, 1986, Fraenkel 1980, Beyer 1971). This is not to say that teacher guidance, demonstrations and variations on controlled practice would not be a part of instruction, but they are not likely to be evident in neatly sequenced steps, or all in one class period, or as major focal points of the instructional effort. Arguably, various dimensions of these learnings may be delineated into subskills. But is the learner who must do the delineating if it is to be mean-

ingful. Furthermore, these delineations play an instrumental role and are not ends in themselves. The parts and even their sum are not to be confused with the whole.

Social studies intentionally encourages student interdependence and mental-ideational risk taking. Keeping things simple, linear and focused on correct answers in anathema to good social studies. Mistakes or errors are rich sources of important insights, intellectual and affective learning. The content of social studies (not to be confused with the content of the textbook) permeates the rest of the curriculum. Good social studies educators pursue integration. Quick, blunt transitions may interrupt a more fruitful flow and confluence of ideas, etc. with other content areas.

The third and most obvious reason has to do with the paucity of empirical studies using the direct instructional model to address social studies learnings (review FIGURE 1). Of the few studies that did address social studies and that found positive correlations between direct instruction and achievement outcomes, the learnings were of a factual or concept-naming type, hardly the raison d'etre of social studies. Even if the behaviorist paradigm were acceptable, the evidence from extant studies is insufficient.

## Conclusions and Recommendations

ETTP is arguably little more than the product of expediency. The research review upon which it is based, even with its restricted selection and procedural flaws, is replete

with warnings; warnings that state clearly the limits and constraints of the research it reviewed. The research used as the basis for ETTP reflects a minimalist conceptual framework for thinking about learning and the influence of instruction on learning. Categorical teacher functions are defined solely in terms of specific examples of behavior. Furthermore, it really does not reflect a theoretical framework for explaining the influence of instruction on learning. Essentially it describes nothing more than that in classrooms where certain teacher behaviors were observed, class-aggregated test score gains were also observed. ETTP has turned these descriptive correlations into causative prescriptions, clearly a case of excessive inductive generalizing. An analogy comes to mind because it illustrates the dire consequences of such generalizing: members of the medical profession prescribing aspirin for ulcers, because they had observed that it helps relieve headache pain. The lesson: until the nature of certain types of learnings are better understood and the nature of the influence teaching methods/strategies/behaviors have on them is better explained, we should be extremely cautious in our treatment prescriptions, lest we do harm. A second lesson: if teachers are to be perceived by themselves as professionals, then "training" of the type exemplified in ETTP should be radically revised. in its present form ETTP undermines reflective, informed decision-making by practitioners. It distracts attention from important complex learnings. It endangers an atmosphere of non-cooperation, suspicion and subversion ("We pass a pair of scissors

from room to room, to alert each other that the evaluator is in the building. Then we all get our six point plan"). Social studies educators, their students, and our society can ill afford such misguided misuse of limited and valuable instruction time.

## Implications for Language Curricula

Despite disclaimers about the generalizability of results of studies of effective teaching (White, et. al., 1983), the prevailing view of those implementing and adopting the Effective Teaching Training Program within the State of North Carolina is that this research, and the direct instruction model which it acclaims, applies to all areas and levels of the curriculum and to all classroom learning situations. This overgeneralization of teacher effectiveness research results in two corollaries which are as false as they are pervasive. In the first place, not only is good teaching equated with direct instruction, but for many school-level practitioners only the direct instruction model is interpreted as good teaching. Second, while direct instruction is seen as the model of instructional methodology, it is purported to be neutral concerning curriculum choices.

A number of authors have controverted the first of these corollaries, arguing that the practices promoted by effective teaching often are not good teaching (Cooper, 1986; Glickman, 1987). This section of the paper challenges the second corollary using examples and illustrations from language learning to

show that the Effective Teaching Training Program does in fact have a strong effect upon curriculum choices and decisions, that it is far from value-free concerning both what is intended to be learned and what is actually learned in schools.

Conceptions of curriculum span a very broad spectrum. A number of writers have tried to make this kaleidoscope of views more comprehensible by suggesting four to seven broad categories of curriculum orientations (Eisner and Vallance, 1974; McNeil, 1985; Miller, 1983). These writers recognize that views about curriculum are only part of a much broader educational philosophy and epistemology. Humanists and technologists not only have different beliefs about what should be learned in schools; they also have in some cases diametrically opposing views about what knowledge is, about the ultimate source of human values, about how learning takes place, and about the roles of teachers and students in the learning process.

The teaching practices and learning conditions adopted by the Effective Teaching Training Program (including the direct instruction model) flow from a technological, process-product conception of curriculum. It is almost impossible to adopt this model of teaching and learning without adopting a constellation of assumptions about education that flow from a behaviorist, logical-positivist ideology which is incompatible with humanistic, developmental, social-reconstructionist, and academic curriculum orientations (McNeil, 1985; Miller, 1983). In spite of claims to the contrary, the Effective Teaching

Training Program represents the imposition of one style of curriculum and one philosophy of education upon the schools and teachers of an entire state.

In a very general sense, no compelling body of proof exists that one curriculum orientation is inherently superior to others, although it has been demonstrated that different educational approaches and teaching styles produce different patterns of results. The first part of this paper, for example, documents the superiority of 'cognitive constructionist' approaches for longterm retention of ideas and for the development of conceptual understandings. Choice between styles of curriculum is essentially a choice of values--if a person values the learning of higher-order thinking skills they will usually reject the focus on discrete tasks and skills and convergent questions and the heavy emphasis on teacher control and high rate of response associated with the school effectiveness research; if on the other hand, they value the rapid acquisition of simple associations and operations, these practices have great appeal.

It must be recognized that there is nothing about the direct instruction model per se that is inherently incompatible with other styles of curriculum. Its negative effects stem from the overgeneralization of this model as it is adopted in practice and extended to all teaching situations and from its effect on curriculum choices. It is interesting to note that Bereiter and Scardamalia (1987) recognize the need for a new and different model of education to produce students capable of

high levels of literacy, yet they still believe that these capabilities can be developed through 'direct instruction.'

If there is any area of development in which one conception of curriculum and learning is clearly superior to another, language acquisition must be considered a claimant. An impressive body of literature (Dale, 1976; deVilliers and deVilliers, 1982; Tough 1982; Wells, 1986; Berko-Gleason, 1986; Lindfors, 1987) has demonstrated that young children whose caretakers attempt to dominate and direct their language productions and development lag behind, on almost every measure of language quality, children whose caretakers allow them to use their own strategies and make their own discoveries about the workings of language. Evidence is currently amassing to indicate that the language of school-age children develops best in the same kind of cognitive-interactionist environment and opportunity that fosters growth for young children. Despite the currency and popularity of teacher effectiveness research, the development of communicative competence (skill in using language), the development of skill in composition, and the development of inferential and critical comprehension receive much stronger support from alternative, contrasting conceptions of learning and teaching, specifically the cognitive-interactionist view.

According to interactionist approaches to language development, language arts programs should meet conditions such as the following (the list supplied is not intended as exhaustive, but is sufficient for the purposes of this paper):

(a) Students should be involved in extensive use of communication processes (speaking, listening, reading and writing) for purposes that are real and valid to the learners (for example, writing letters to real people who will respond) rather than as academic exercises;

(b) Communication situations for language learning should represent a wide range of rhetorical relations and language purposes; that is, students should communicate with a variety of audiences (strangers to intimate friends, infants to aged, peers to subordinates, etc.) in a variety of social situations (informal to formal to ritualistic) for a variety of purposes (informational, instrumental, heuristic, etc.) about topics varying in degrees of abstractness or immediacy (Moffett and Wagner, 1982);

(c) A certain amount of study about language as language may be useful if it is used to inform the processes of using language; but the study of language structure and form, for its own sake, does little to develop skill in composing or comprehending language, and may in fact impede language development because of the lost opportunities to engage in language use (Weaver, 1979).

(d) For the acquisition of both beginning and advanced levels of literacy, teachers must support the development of learners' reading and writing strategies, including the development of cognitive self-monitoring and control strategies. Strategy development is accomplished while students are involved in meaningful reading and writing communication (point

'a' above), but it must be supported by complex, deliberate, and highly skilled teaching strategies. These include modeling, close monitoring of learner strategies, verbalization of strategies, and provision of sufficient time and latitude for learners to apply prediction, repair, and other strategies under their own control (Clay, 1982; Palinscar and Brown, 1984; Bereiter and Scardamalia, 1987).

The implications of these conditions for teaching and learning and for the roles of teacher and learner are far-reaching. Clearly language learning activities should be integrated with the content of other school subjects and with life experiences; yet in school programs language arts is too often isolated from both from subject matter content and from life. Furthermore, various dimensions of language performance (for example, spelling, handwriting, grammar, punctuation, decoding, vocabulary development, comprehension and actual reading and writing) are treated at separate times with little relationship to one another. A technological (behaviorist) approach to education, through its emphasis on discrete learnings, measurable objectives, and tests tends to encourage this kind of compartmentalization of language learnings.

A second implication is that teachers must be allowed the latitude and flexibility to make professional, informed decisions about types and varieties of activities, and to allow student choice in activities, depending upon developmental level and learning needs. What is needed is the development of teacher decision-making skills that support literacy acquisi-

tion, not a simplistic model of teaching behaviors extended to all situations.

A third implication of these conditions is that the measure of language programs should be the quality of the processes and the holistic messages or communications produced. The direct teaching model bases its claims to 'effectiveness' on measurable achievement of formal aspects of language products (e.g., spelling, sentence structure, etc.) rather than the processes or the communicative effectiveness of messages. The result is to encourage the fragmentation and isolation of language dimensions under the name of language arts.

Finally, the direct teaching model discourages just those kinds of activities that foster growth in communicative competence. Small discussion groups, group or individual projects involving student choice, role-playing situations, readers theater, creative and improvisation drama, and individualized, non-directed reading do not provide situations in which the teacher appears to be in command of the essential lesson steps of the model. Therefore, through the influence of the Effective Teaching Training Program, teachers are discouraged from using the kinds of strategies and activities that are demonstrated to be effective in reaching the broader goals of language development and the achievement of literacy. Ironically, the Standard Course of Study recently adopted by the State of North Carolina gives higher priority to the achievement of communicative competence and the ability to compose and comprehend language than it does to the acquisition of language

conventions and forms. Unfortunately, the new curriculum appears to be unrelated to the teacher training program, to the program for evaluating teachers for career ladder status, and to the state testing program. What is recognized by experts as good conditions for language learning remains the elusive ideal. Meanwhile the Effective Teacher Training Program exerts powerful leverage on the operational curriculum of the schools in a direction almost diametrically opposed.

## REFERENCES


Anderson, L. M., Evertson, C. M., & Brophy, J. E., "An Experimental Study of Effective Teaching in First-Grade Reading Groups," The Elementary School Journal, 1979, 79 4.

Armento, B. J., "Teacher Behaviors Related to Student Achievement on a Social Studies Concept Test." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 1976 (ERIC No. ED 126 145).

Armento, B. J., "Research on Teaching Social Studies," Handbook of Research on Teaching, 3rd ed. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., 1986.

Bereiter, C., and Scardamalia, M., "An attainable version of high literacy; Approaches to teaching higher-order skills in reading and writing." Curriculum Inquiry, 17, 1, Spring 1987.

Brophy, J. E., & Evertson, C. M. "Process-Product Correlations in the Texas Teacher Effectiveness Study: Final Report." Austin, Texas 1974 ERIC No. ED 091 394).

Brophy, J. E. "Reflections on Research in Elementary Schools," Journal of Teacher Education, 1976, 27 1.

Brophy, J. E., & Evertson, C. M. Learning from Teaching: A Developmental Perspective. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1976.

Brophy, J. E. "Teacher Behavior and Student Learning," Educational Leadership, 1979, 37 1.

Brophy, J. E. "Teacher Behavior and Its Effects," Journal of Educational Psychology, 1979, 71 6.

Clay, M., Reading: The patterning of complex behavior. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1979.

Dale, P., Language development: Structure and function, 2nd edition. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.

deVilliers, J., and deVilliers, P., Language acquisition. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1978.

Doyle, Walter. "Paradigms for Research on Teacher Effectiveness," Review of Research in Education, 5th Edition, 1977.

Doyle, Walter. "Student Mediating Responses in Teaching Effectiveness." Paper presented at annual conference of American Educational Research Association, Toronto, March 1978.

Educational Leadership, May 1985, 42 8.

Eisner E., and Vallance, E., (Eds.), Conflicting conceptions of curriculum. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1974.

Ellis, A. K., & Ryan, F. L. Instructional Implications of Inquiry. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974.

Evertson, C. M., Anderson, L., & Brophy, J. E. "Texas Junior High School Study: Final Report of Process-Outcome Relationships." Austin, Texas: University of Texas, 1978.

Fair, J., & Shaftel, F. (eds). Effective Thinking in the Social Studies 37th Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1967.

Fenstermacher, G. D. "A Philosophical Consideration of Recent Research on Teacher Effectiveness," Review of Research in Education, 6th Edition, 1978.

Fortune, J. C. "A Study of the Generality of Presenting Behavior in Teaching," Memphis, Tennessee, 1967 (ERIC No. ED 016 285).

Gall, M. D. "Synthesis of Research on Teacher's Questioning," Educational Leadership, 1984, 42 3.

Glickman, C., "Good and/or effective schools: What do we want?" Phi Delta Kappan, April, 1987, 622-624.

Good, T. L. & Grouws, D. A. "Teaching Effects: A Process-Product Study in Fourth Grade Mathematics Classrooms," Journal of Teacher Education, 1977, 28 3.

Good, T. L. & Grouws, D. A. "Teaching and Mathematics Learning," Educational Leadership, 1979, 37 1.

Good, T. L. "Teacher Effectiveness in the Elementary School," Journal of Teacher Education, 1979, 30 2.

Kozma, R. "Instructional Design in a Chemistry Laboratory Course: The Impacts of Structure and Aptitudes on Performance and Attitudes," Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 1982, 19.

Lindfors, J., Children's language and learning. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1980.

Lockheed, J. "Research Synthesis on Problem Solving," Educational Leadership, 1981, 39 1.

MacKenzie, A. A., & White R. T. "Fieldwork in Geography and Long-Term Memory Structures," American Educational Research Journal, 1982, 19 4.

McFall, S. "An Examination of Direct Instruction," Educational Leadership, 1983, 41 5.

McNeil, J., Curriculum: A comprehensive introduction. Boston: Little Brown and Co., 1982.

Martorella, P., Concept Learning: Designs for Instruction. Scranton, Pa.: International Textbook Co., 1972.

Martorella, P., Elementary Social Studies. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1985.

Medley, D. M., Teacher Competence and Teacher Effectiveness: A Review of Process-Product Research. Washington, D.C.: AACTE, 1977

Medley, D. M. "The Effectiveness of Teachers," in Research on Teaching: Concepts, Findings and Implications. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Co., 1979.

Miller, J., The educational spectrum: Orientations to curriculum. New York: Longman, 1983.

Moffett, W., and Wagner, B., Student-centered language arts and reading, K-13: A handbook for teachers. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1983.

Pearson, P.D., and Gallagher, M. D., "The Instruction of Reading Comprehension," Contemporary Educational Psychology, 1983, 8, 1983.

Peterson, P. L., "Direct Instruction Reconsidered," Research on Teaching: Concepts, Findings and Implications. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Co., 1979.

Peterson, P. L., "Direct Instruction: Effective for What and for Whom?" Educational Leadership, 1979, 37, 1.

Redfield, D. L., and Rousseau, E. W., "A Meta-analysis of Experimental Research on Teacher Questioning Behavior," Review of Educational Research, 1961, 51, 2.

Rosenshine, B., "Recent Research on Teaching Behaviors and Student Achievement," Journal of Teacher Education. 1976, 27, 1.

Rosenshine, B., "Content, Time, and Direct Instruction," Research on Teaching: Concepts, Findings and Implications. McCutchan Publishing Co., 1979.

Rosenshine, B., "Synthesis of Research on Explicit Teaching," Educational Leadership, 1986, 43, 7.

Solomon, D., "The Scientific Basis of the Art of Teaching: Essay Review," The Elementary School Journal, 1979, 79, 4.

Stallings, J., and Kaskowitz, D., Follow-Through: Classroom Observable Evaluation, 1972-1973. Washington, DC: Office of Education, 1974.

Taba, H., Teaching Strategies and Cognitive Functioning in Elementary School Children. Washington, DC: Office of Education, 1966.

Taba, H., et. al., A Teacher's Handbook to Elementary Social Studies, 2nd Edition. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1971.

Tobias, S., "When Do Instructional Methods Make a Difference?" Educational Researcher, 1982, 11, 4.

Tough, J., The development of meaning. New York: Halstead Press, 1977.

Wells, G., The meaning makers. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1986.

White, K., Wyne, M., Stuck, G., and Coop, R., Teacher effectiveness evaluation project: Final report. Chapel Hill, NC, 1983.

Wittrock, M. C., "Learning as a Generative Process." Educational Psychologist, 1974, 11.

Wittrock, M. C., "The Cognitive Movement in Instruction." Educational Psychologist, 1978, 13.